

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 3 and 4 are requested to be cancelled.

Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 10, and 12 are currently being amended.

This amendment changes and deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 2, and 5-12 are now pending in this application.

In the outstanding office action, certain phrases of claim 1 were objected to as lacking antecedent basis and claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 1 has been amended to address the objection and rejection. As such the Applicant respectfully requests the object and rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Wu in view of Subramaniam. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The claims of the subject application are directed to a wireless connectivity arrangement in which applications running via Internet access are forced to an encrypting security service port. The independent claims describe a situation where an access control point initiates an authentication, authorization and accounting (AAA) for a terminal and forces applications to switch their traffic to an encrypting security service port. In other words, the AAA procedure and enforcement to switch to an encrypting security service port are effected by the same entity (access control point) which also provides an Internet access gateway functionality. This enables a simple solution to encrypt all traffic of wireless local area networks which access the applications via the Internet without the need to implement

new software and/or new hardware at the end user's side. Moreover, it can be implemented that encryption is only forced for correctly authenticated end users.

In contrast, neither Wu nor Subramaniam disclose or suggest an access control point having these characteristics. The Examiner argues that the Wu reference describes a wireless connectivity arrangement, but does not disclose enforcing application corresponding to the Inter access request of the user terminal to switch their traffic to an encrypting security service port.. However, the Examiner argues that Subramaniam discloses this feature.

The Applicant believes the Examiner's rejection is improper because the Examiner has not provided any basis for combining the references. The Examiner recognizes that the Wu reference does not teach the features claimed in the subject application. Yet with no support, and in seeming contradiction to his own assertions, the Examiner concluded that it would be obvious to combining the references. Applicant understands that a minimal amount of hindsight reasoning results simply by virtue of the fact that the recited combination of prior art was prompted by the examination of the present application. However, Applicant submits that the Examiner still must rely on some evidentiary support, e.g., some suggestion or motivation, in order to avoid the prior art combination constituting impermissible hindsight reasoning.

Nevertheless, even if the Wu and Subramaniam references were combined, they would not disclose or teach an access control point having the particular features claimed in the subject application, in particular forcing traffic to be switched to an encrypting security port. For example, claim 1 requires:

... enforcing the application to switch its traffic to an encrypting security port *by the access control point*. (emphasis added).

Independent claims 7 and 10 include similar elements. Because the cited prior art does not disclosure or suggest an access control point having the features claimed in independent claims 1, 7, and 10, the Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable over the cited prior art. Furthermore, dependent claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, and 12

depend either directly from one of these allowable independent claims and are also therefore allowable. As such, the Applicant request that the Examiner withdraw his objection to the currently pending claims. Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0872.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 28, 2007

By /G. Peter Albert Jr./

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 30542
Telephone: (858) 847-6735
Facsimile: (858) 792-6773

G. Peter Albert Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,268